

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

FRIDAY, THE 16TH NOVEMBER 2007 / 25TH KARTHIKA 1929

W.P(C).No. 33909 of 2007 - J

PETITIONER:

**RAKIN RAJ V.P. (MINOR), VALIYAPARAMBATHU,
HOUSE, NEAR BANK ROAD, PUTHIYARKARA PO, PUTHUPPANAM
VIA, VADAKARA, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY
HIS FATHER & NATURAL GUARDIAN, RAJAN, VALIYAPARAM-
BATHU HOUSE, NEAR BANK ROAD, PUTHIYARKARA PO,
PUTHUPPANAM VIA, VADAKARA, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.K.B.ARUNKUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER, 27TH STATE LEVEL
WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMME, KERALA STATE,
THODUPUZZHA.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
KERALA STATE, TRIVANDRUM.**
- 3. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
VATAKARA EDUCATIONAL DISTRICT,
VATAKARA.**
- 4. THE GENERAL CONVENOR,
WORK EXPERIENCE COMPETITION,
VATAKARA EDUCATIONAL DISTRICT,
VATAKARA.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER, SRI.I.V. PRAMOD

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 16/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.
=====

W.P.(C) NO. 33909 OF 2007 - J
=====

Dated this the 16th day of November, 2007

J U D G M E N T

Petitioner was a participant in the on-the-spot products using straw boards in a District Level Competition held on 5/11/2007. It is submitted that in the previous years, petitioner has been a successful candidate in this very item of competition. This year petitioner was not given any prize. Petitioner submits that this has happened only on account of the illegality committed by the judges, who have assessed his performance. Petitioner also submits that aggrieved by the denial of prize, he had made a complaint to the 3rd respondent and that orders have not been passed.

2. In this writ petition, although petitioner has made certain vague allegations against the denial of prize, petitioner has not produced any material before this court to even prima facie, form an opinion that the alleged denial was illegal. Petitioner also has not explained as to why he is claiming to be superior to the other participants. In this factual situation, this court is not in a position to adjudicate on the claim raised in this writ petition.

2. Irrespective of that, now that the petitioner submits that he has filed a complaint to the 3rd respondent, I direct the 3rd respondent to examine the complaint, if such a complaint has been received. On such examination, if the 3rd respondent is satisfied that injustice has been done to the petitioner, such remedial action as is warranted in the circumstances shall be taken.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

**ANTONY DOMINIC,
JUDGE**

Rp